TRAITÉ DE COPÉRATION EN MATIÈRE DE BRA ETS

PCT

RAPPORT PRÉLIMINAIRE INTERNATIONAL SUR LA BREVETABILITÉ (chapitre I du Traité de coopération en matière de brevets)

(règle 44bis du PCT)

Référence du dossier du déposant ou du mandataire 9670WO	POUR SUITE À DONNER	Voir le point 4 ci-dessous		
Demande internationale no. PCT/FR2005/000319	Date du dépôt international (jour/mois/année) 10 February 2005 (10.02.2005)	Date de priorité (jour/mois/année) 16 February 2004 (16.02.2004)		
Classification internationale des brevets (8 ^e edition, sauf indication d'une #dition ant#rieure) Voir les informations pertinentes dans le formulaire PCT/ISA/237				
Déposant WAVECOM				

1.	Le présent rapport préliminaire international sur la brevetabilité (chapitre I) est établi par le Bureau international au nom de l'administration chargée de la recherche internationale selon la règle 44bis.1.a).					
2.	Ce RAPPORT comprend un total de 7 feuilles, y compris la présente feuille de couverture.					
	Dans les feuilles jointes, toute référence à l'opinion écrite de l'administration chargée de la recherche internationale doit être entendue, à la place, comme une référence au rapport préliminaire international sur la brevetabilité (chapitre I).					
3.	Le présent rapport contient des	indications relatives aux points suivants :				
	Cadre n° I	Base de l'opinion				
	Cadre n° II	Priorité				
	Cadre n° III	Absence de formulation d'opinion quant à la nouveauté, l'activité inventive et la possibilité d'application industrielle				
	Cadre n° IV	Absence d'unité de l'invention				
	Cadre n° V	Déclaration motivée selon l'article 35.2) quant à la nouveauté, l'activité inventive et la possibilité d'application industrielle; citations et explications à l'appui de cette déclaration				
	Cadre n° VI	Certains documents cités				
	Cadre n° VII	Certaines irrégularités relevées dans la demande internationale				
	Cadre n° VIII	Certaines observations relatives à la demande internationale				
4.		niquera le présent rapport aux offices désignés conformément aux règles 44bis.3.c) et 93bis.1 élai de 30 mois à compter de la date de priorité (règle 44bis.2), sauf si le déposant a présenté une vertu de l'article 23.2).				

	Date d'établissement du présent rapport 01 November 2006 (01.11.2006)		
Bureau international de l'OMPI 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Fonctionnaire autorisé Beate Giffo-Schmitt		
no de télécopieur +41 22 338 82 70	e-mail: pt03@wipo.int		

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing See form PCT/ISA/210 (day/month/year) Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION 9670WO See paragraph 2 below International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) PCT/FR2005/000319 10.02.2005 16.02.2004 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC H04Q7/Q8, H04L27/26, H04Q7/22, H04B7/26 Applicant WAVECOM This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial Box No. V applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and mailing address of the ISA/EP Authorized officer Facsimile No. Telephone No.

International application No.

PCT/FR2005/000319

Во	x No. I	Basis of this opinion
L	With filed,	regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was unless otherwise indicated under this item.
		This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under
	_	Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2.	With inven	regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed tion, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a.	type of material
		a sequence listing
		table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b.	format of material
	[in written format
		in computer readable form
İ	c.	time of filing/furnishing
	[contained in the international application as filed.
	[filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
	[furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.		In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4.	Additi	onal comments;

International application No.
PCT/FR2005/000319

<i>D</i> (0)			me 43bis.1(a)(i) with i pporting such statem	regard to novelty, inventive step ent	or industrial applicability;	
1.	Statement					
	Novelty (N)	Claims	1-24		YE:	s
		Claims			NO NO	
	Inventive step (IS)	Claims			YES	s
		Claims	1-24		NO	
	Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-24	3	YES	s
		Claims			NO	
	<u> </u>					

- 2. Citations and explanations:
 - 2. Reference is made to the following document:

D1: US 2003/081538 A1 (WALTON JAY R ET AL) 1 May 2003 (01-05-2003)

3. The present application fails to comply with the requirements of PCT Article 33(1) since the subject matter of independent claims 1, 19, 23 and 24 does not meet the criterion for novelty defined in PCT Article 33(2).

Document D1 describes (the references in parentheses apply to this document):

A system in which a supplementary channel is connected to a principal bidirectional symmetrical channel, the said principal bidirectional symmetrical channel comprising a principal uplink path and a principal downlink path (paragraph 26: "IS-95, cdma2000, IS-856, W-CDMA", etc.), ensuring particularly the transmission of data and signalling and control information at low or medium speed [see Section 1 below] (paragraph 28,

International application No.
PCT/FR2005/000319

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

first phrase), and at least one supplementary channel influenced only in the downlink direction ensuring particularly the transmission of data at a high speed [see Section 1 below], implementing a multi-carrier technique ensuring a distribution of data over space time / frequency (paragraph 1: "hybrid OFDM-CDMA") and having a sub-frame structure (paragraph 44: the OFDM signal in D1 consists of consecutive symbols, which correspond to "sub-frames" in the application), which includes a stage of synchronisation of the supplementary channel at the sub-frame level (paragraph 62: "OFDM symbol timing")

itself comprising the following stages:

- detection of a defined instant on the principal channel;
- obtaining the beginning of a sub-frame in the supplementary channel, by shifting the instant detected forward by an given interval of time, which is not zero (paragraph 62: use of a pilot signal for synchronising the supplementary channel; paragraphs 55 and 122: D1 considers different embodiments for this pilot signal see paragraphs 118 to 121 to paragraph 122; it is mentioned however that this pilot signal, derived from the principal channel, can be repeated periodically at a lower rate than that of the symbols the knowledge and use of the shift time is therefore implicit, as it is not possible to see how the system could function otherwise).

The subject matter of claim 1 differs from D1 in that

International application No.
PCT/FR2005/000319

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

the said supplementary channel is **only** affected in the downlink direction, whereas in D1 the supplementary channel is used in both the **uplink and downlink** directions (paragraphs 72 to 92 for the discussion of the up transmission on the supplementary channel). Whether or not a channel working in **upwards** direction using a multi-carrier technique is **present** or **absent** is irrelevant to the solution of the problem to be solved, which is the synchronisation of the channel of the supplementary channel in a downwards direction.

4. Dependent claims 2 to 18 and 20 to 22 do not contain features, which combined with the features of any claim to which they refer, satisfy the requirements of the PCT with regard to novelty and inventive step (PCT Article 33 (2) and (3).

International application No.
PCT/FR2005/000319

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the claims of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

1. The expressions "high speed" and "low or medium speed" are relative and do not define the scope of the claims which use them. Moreover, they are both preceded by the word "particularly", which indicates that the subject matter of the claims can be modified by the substitution of unspecified features.

Therefore claims 1 to 24 do not satisfy the requirement for clarity stipulated in PCT Article 6, as supplemented by the PCT Guidelines Section 5.34.